



CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE JUSTICE INFORMATION ADVISORY GROUP

**2015-2016 BIENNIAL REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR, SUPREME COURT AND LEGISLATURE ON CRIMINAL
JUSTICE INFORMATION INTEGRATION**

JANUARY 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary..... 3

List of members as of January 2017..... 5

Legislative Recommendations 7

Activities of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Advisory Group, Policy Group and Task Force 8

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Minnesota Statutes, section 299C.65 Subdivision 3(a) requires the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Advisory Group to file a biennial report providing: 1) a status and review of current integration efforts and projects; 2) any recommendations concerning any legislative changes or appropriations that are needed to ensure that the criminal justice information systems operate accurately and efficiently; and 3) a summary of the activities of the Advisory Group. This report endeavors to fulfill that requirement.

Minnesota Statutes, section 299C.65 was amended this past legislative session to create a new Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Advisory Group (Advisory Group) effective August 1, 2016 which replaced the previous Criminal and Juvenile Justice Policy Group (Policy Group) and Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Task Force (Task Force). This was the result of the Policy Group and Task Force completing a strategic planning process in 2015 and recommending to the legislature that the two groups be merged into one new group, the Criminal and Juvenile Advisory Group (Advisory Group).

The new Advisory Group shall serve as the state advisory group on statewide criminal justice information policy and funding issues. The Advisory Group shall study and make recommendations to the governor, the Supreme Court, and the legislature on criminal justice information funding and policy issues such as related data practices, individual privacy rights, and data on race and ethnicity; information-sharing at the local, state and federal levels; technology education and innovation; the impact of proposed legislation on the criminal justice system related to information systems and business processes; and data and identification standards.

In addition to the strategic planning process and the new direction for the Advisory Group, this report includes responsive activities of the Policy Group from January 2014 through August 2016.

BACKGROUND

More than 1,600 agencies and branches of local, state, and federal government oversee the justice and public safety services delivered in Minnesota, at a cost of nearly \$2.5 billion per year to the public, according to past census estimates and auditor's reports. Each of these agencies needs timely and accurate information at key decision points throughout the criminal justice process. To assure that information is accessible and managed from a statewide perspective, the Legislature created the Policy Group and Task Force in Minnesota Statutes, section 299C.65 in 1993.

The Policy Group gathered a wide-range of state and local criminal justice stakeholders and policymakers to address issues related to the statewide integration of criminal justice information from a broad-based perspective. The Task Force assisted the Policy Group in these duties. Starting in 2001, these efforts were coordinated by the CriMNet Program Office, which was part of the Minnesota Justice Information Services (MNJIS) section at the Minnesota Bureau of Criminal Apprehension (BCA). Together, the Policy Group, Task Force, and MNJIS executive director provided key leadership in managing the direction of criminal justice integration activities statewide.

Early integration-related activities focused on filling significant gaps in statewide criminal and juvenile justice data such as statewide predatory offender data, electronic booking photos, and complete criminal history information. Systems to collect that information from agencies statewide are now in place.

Because integration work will always be needed to improve criminal justice information systems, the Legislature created the new Advisory Group to continue the work of the Policy Group and Task Force to study and make recommendations

to the governor, the Supreme Court, and the Legislature on statewide criminal justice information policy and funding issues.

CORE PRIORITIES

Advisory Group

The Advisory Group had its first meeting in December 2016. The current priorities include work being done through Advisory Group subcommittees related to data practices; data and identification standards; and collaborative relationships and funding.

Policy Group

In 2015 and 2016, the Policy Group, Task Force, and BCA worked with constituents to prioritize information integration needs and related initiatives. The Policy Group focused on five core priorities.

- **New Crime Reporting System (CRS)** –The new statewide Crime Reporting System (CRS) was completed in 2016 after being funded by the Legislature in 2013. It allows MN law enforcement agencies to submit more detailed incident reporting and crime statistics and transition to the FBI’s preferred crime reporting system (National Incident Based Reporting System – NIBRS). Collecting more detailed crime statistics provides better information for agencies to plan and deploy resources more effectively as well as better information for education and research purposes. The new CRS was NIBRS-certified by the FBI in August 2016. Carver County Sheriff’s Office is the first pilot agency to successfully submit NIBRS data to the new system. With the 3-year development of the new system complete, the BCA has received federal funding and will continue to work with agencies in MN to transition to NIBRS reporting to increase information sharing and improve public safety.
- **New Criminal History System (CHS)** –The Legislature funded development of a new Criminal History System (CHS) in 2013. The new system will improve security controls for data access, will be easier to integrate with other systems, and will reduce manual processes and the risk of data entry errors. In 2015 and 2016 system developers worked with stakeholders across the criminal justice spectrum to develop performance requirements, improve system capabilities and identify security needs. Full deployment of the new system is planned for 2018.
- **eCharging** – This is a secure, electronic method for creating criminal complaints, incident referrals, DWI forms, citations and search warrants. The service replaces the paper process, eliminates redundant data entry, reduces incidents of human error, and saves a significant amount of staff time, particularly for law enforcement and court personnel. Development of electronic search warrants was completed in 2016 and statewide deployment will begin in early 2017.
- **Single Sign-On (SSO)** – This is a secure, single access point and password for entry into state criminal justice systems by authorized personnel. Work to bring several statewide systems into the SSO domain was completed in 2015 and 2016.
- **New Orders for Protection (OFP) System** – A new Orders for Protection (OFP) system was deployed statewide in early 2016. The new system provides real-time delivery of OFP information to better ensure the safety of protected parties by getting information to law enforcement much faster. It also saves courts and law enforcement agencies from entering the same data in multiple systems and standardizes case processing forms.

CONCLUSION

We are pleased to report significant progress in the efforts to integrate information within Minnesota criminal justice agency systems, as well as progress in efforts to make providing and obtaining that information more efficient. Significant progress was made on the Policy Group core priority projects. The Advisory Group now builds on these efforts as it begins a new era for oversight of criminal justice information integration.

LIST OF ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS AS OF JANUARY 2017

Commissioner of Corrections designee Deb Kerschner

Commissioner of Public Safety designee Oded Galili
State Chief Information Officer Thomas A. Baden, Jr.
Supreme Court appointee Judge Richard C. Ilkka
Supreme Court appointee Judge Patrick Diamond
Supreme Court appointee Dean A. Buker
Commissioner of Administration designee Laurie Beyer-Kropuenske
State Court Administrator Jeff Shorba
Minnesota Sheriffs Association appointee Lt. Spencer Bakke
Minnesota Sheriffs Association appointee Sheriff Rick Duncan
Minnesota Chiefs of Police Association appointee Director Cari Gerlicher
Minnesota Chiefs of Police Association appointee Chief Jeff McCormick
Minnesota County Attorneys Association appointee Mark Ostrem
Minnesota County Attorneys Association appointee G. Paul Beaumaster
League of Minnesota Cities appointee Amy K.L. Schmidt
League of Minnesota Cities appointee Shana Conklin
League of Minnesota Cities appointee Jay Arrowsmith DeCoux
League of Minnesota Cities appointee Steve Washburn
Board of Public Defense appointee Steve Holmgren
Board of Public Defense appointee Kathy Hoyle
Association of Minnesota Counties appointee Jon Ramlo
Association of Minnesota Counties appointee Terry Fawcett
Commissioner of Corrections appointee Tim MacMillan
Commissioner of Corrections appointee Rick Smith
Public member appointed by the Governor – Safia Kahn
Public member appointed by the Governor – vacant
Public member appointed by the Governor – vacant
Public member appointed by the Governor – vacant
Minnesota Association for Court Management appointee Paula Lang
Minnesota Association for Court Management appointee Tracy Gullerud
Minnesota Association of Counties appointee Jeff Johnson
Minnesota Association of Counties appointee Marv Bodie
Speaker of the House of Representatives appointee Representative Brian Johnson
Senate Majority Leader appointee – vacant
Minnesota Attorney General appointee David Miller
Sentencing Guidelines Commission Director Nate Reitz

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, section 299C.65, subdivision 2, the Advisory Group must provide a report to the Legislature by January 15 every other year detailing the statutory changes and/or appropriations necessary to ensure the efficient and effective operation of criminal justice information systems. The Policy Group adopted the following recommendations for the Legislature's consideration during the 2015 and 2016 legislative sessions.

2015 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Policy Group made no recommendations in 2015.

2016 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Policy Group recommended a change be made to its enabling statute, 299C.65, formally establishing the Advisory Group to replace the Policy Group and Task Force, with defined tasks and responsibilities. The statute was changed and the Advisory Group was established on August 1, 2016.

2017 RECOMMENDATIONS

While the Policy Group did not review the legislative recommendations before it was dissolved in August 2016, the Task Force did approve the following budget initiatives to be forwarded to the Policy Group for its consideration:

- The Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Apprehension requested \$4.1 million to replace the current Predatory Offender Registration system (POR). This is estimated to be a two-year development project and includes the POR database, law enforcement website, and the public non-compliant website.
- The Minnesota Counties Computer Cooperative User Group and the Department of Corrections requested \$200,000 to develop software to improve the process of managing an offender's release from prison into community supervision.
- The Minnesota County Attorneys Association and the Board of Public Defense requested \$1.25 million to build an electronic path for documents to pass from the courts to county attorneys and public defenders, and the development of a notification process via case and content management systems when new documents are filed.

At its meeting in December, the Advisory Group discussed the challenges of funding these integration projects and the best method to vet them through the Governor's and/or the Legislature's budget processes. Historically, integration projects have gone through the primary state agency involved; however, this can also create challenges as these integration projects may compete with other agency priorities.

ACTIVITIES OF THE CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE JUSTICE INFORMATION POLICY AND ADVISORY GROUPS

As noted above, the Advisory Group had its first meeting in December 2016. The current priorities include work being done through Advisory Group subcommittees related to data practices; data and identification standards; and collaborative relationships and funding.

Significant progress was made by the Policy Group in 2015-2016 in the development and implementation of the core priorities as detailed above. The Policy Group also reviewed and acted on recommendations made by the Task Force, reviewed other projects (such as the eCourts initiative), conducted annual evaluations of the MNJIS executive director, and reviewed budget and policy issues/implications.

One of the most important efforts of the Policy Group and Task Force was the strategic planning process, redefining the overall goals, and recommending to the Legislature to merge the two groups and move to an advisory group model. The Policy Group and Task Force examined their current function and ongoing value to criminal justice information integration in Minnesota. The landscape of integrated criminal justice systems and services has changed significantly as a result of their work over the past 20 years, and the Policy Group and Task Force looked to define their future roles in the development of criminal justice information policy, direction and laws. Eventually, the Policy Group acted on a Task Force recommendation and proposed changes to its establishing statutory language that would combine the Policy Group and Task Force into a single Advisory Group. The statute was changed and the legislature formalized the Advisory Group's purview in 299C.65, subd. 1c.

During its work to identify ongoing/future needs, the Policy Group and Task Force also identified four areas where the Advisory Group could provide ongoing expertise.

- Data Practices – Advisory Group members are a diverse cross-section of the criminal justice community and would be in a position to be a meaningful resource in policy development on issues related to criminal justice data practices.
- Collaborative Relationships – the Advisory Group is well connected to all areas of criminal justice and as such is in a unique position to develop partnerships and buy-in for new and ongoing projects.
- Data and Identification Standards – the Task Force recognized that Advisory Group members are not only well versed in criminal justice data and identification needs, but technologically capable of identifying solutions to issues.
- Education and Innovation – the Advisory Group members hold and can access expertise in criminal justice trends and emerging technologies which may be relevant to future integration development.

There were also two other delivery teams or subcommittees that met during 2015 and 2016.

ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE TASK FORCE DELIVERY TEAM

The Task Force established a delivery team to help develop a new electronic method for exchanging court-related documents between prosecutors and public defenders that doesn't interfere with other systems already in place. The new system enables prosecutors and probation to email documents to the public defender's content management system. In the past, prosecutors and public defenders exchanged information using email attachments, CD's and FTP sites. The Judicial Branch will build a data exchange between the courts and the public defense system.

CIVIL COMMITMENT DATA TASK FORCE DELIVERY TEAM

A Task Force delivery team studied ways to improve law enforcement access to public civil commitment data existing in the court system (MNCIS). The goal is to enhance public safety and officer safety when dealing with mentally ill individuals, and divert individuals when appropriate from jail to mental health professionals. The Task Force approved for Policy Group review a delivery team recommendation that patrol personnel receive the information as part of a standard query they already run whenever they encounter individuals in the field. The Bureau of Criminal Apprehension and State Court Administration would need to build a data pass to make this possible. The BCA and Courts have been awarded a State Court Administration technology grant to analyze the feasibility of the solution recommended.